

LB
3218
C2
M25
1961
copy 1
IGSL

BERKELEY

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION STUDY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

BUREAU OF PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION LIBRARY

JUN 16 1961

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C101743837>

JC521
B3e.M2
June 6, 1961

School administration

Berkeley

LB3218

C2

M25

1961

copy 1

IGSL

UCB

AN EVALUATION OF SCHOOL FACILITY NEEDS

A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

by

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS

James D. MacConnell William R. Odell

William H. Strand

Stanford, California

June 6, 1961

School arch Berkeley

BUREAU OF PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION LIBRARY

JUN 19 1961

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF EDUCATION
BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Alice W. Sackett	- President
Mr. Spurgeon Avakian	- Vice President
Mr. H. Quayle Petersmeyer	- Director
Dr. Paul J. Sanazaro	- Director
Rev. Roy Nichols	- Director

Mr. C. H. Wernerberg
Superintendent of Schools

INTRODUCTION

Four weeks ago, May 8, 1961, these consultants were engaged by the Board of Education, Berkeley Unified School District, to survey the school facility needs of the District and to evaluate the Citizens Advisory Committee Report (Corlett Report) that was presented to the Board in December, 1960.

It has not been our responsibility to study the total educational program of the District. We have been concerned solely with school building facility needs -- hence this report does not address itself to any other problems of the Berkeley public school system.

During the course of this study we have visited all of the public schools in Berkeley and have reviewed all reports made to the Board concerning the school facilities problem, beginning with the Reller Report of 1956.

The last bond authorization that received voter approval was in 1949. This provided funds for some new construction as well as considerable building remodeling and renovation. Even though considerable construction took place during the past decade the building needs of the District have

continued to mount due to increased enrollments and accumulating obsolescence. The Board of Education, cognizant of the mounting needs of the District, has presented three bond issues to the community since April, 1959 -- all three failing to gain the necessary majority for approval. It does not appear, however, that the previous proposals have asked for excessive amounts of money but have tried to provide amounts necessary to eliminate obsolescence and safety hazards and to bring existing facilities up-to-date to meet the educational demands placed upon them by the citizens of Berkeley.

The following report is our analysis of the school facilities needs of the Berkeley Unified School District as of the present time.

SCHOOL FACILITY NEEDS

Age of Buildings

Visitations to the schools of the Berkeley Unified School District indicate widespread school facility needs at all levels of the educational system -- elementary, junior high and senior high school. Several of the buildings are extremely old and most buildings are seriously overcrowded.

The following Table indicates the decade in which various school buildings were erected.

TABLE I

<u>1900-1909</u>	<u>1910-1919</u>	<u>1920-1929</u>	<u>1930-1939</u>	<u>1940-1949</u>	<u>1950-1959</u>
Emerson Oxford	John Muir Thousand Oaks Burbank Jr. H.S. Willard Jr. H.S.	Cragmont Hillside Jefferson (Prim. Unit) Lincoln Longfellow Garfield Jr. H.S. Berkeley H.S.	Whittier		Cragmont Primary Franklin Primary Hillside Primary Columbus Jefferson (main bldg.) Le Conte Washington Franklin Elem.

Brief examination of the Table indicates that the majority of the buildings in the District were erected prior to 1930, with the Emerson and Oxford buildings being over 50 years old. These schools have certainly served the District well for many years. They were designed and erected to meet the needs of another day and, for the most part, can be considered obsolete according to today's standards and demands.

Further examination of the Table indicates that considerable construction took place during the past decade. All or major portions of five buildings were erected as well as three Kindergarten - Primary units. Examination of the newer facilities indicates a few needs but, for the most part, these buildings are satisfactorily meeting the educational demands of the community.

ENROLLMENTS

Enrollment data supplied by the central administrative office indicates that most buildings are seriously overcrowded. Current enrollment, (October 31, 1960) is 15,761 children enrolled in the Berkeley schools. Maximum rated capacity of all permanent buildings approximates 13,000 students. Seven elementary schools have enrollments exceeding 600; two exceed 800; and one school has an

enrollment in excess of 900. The three Junior High Schools have enrollments exceeding 1000 each, Garfield Junior High School with an approximate capacity (permanent housing) of 875 enrolls 1662, and Willard Junior High School with an approximate capacity (permanent housing) of 750 enrolls 1006, Berkeley High School with a capacity of approximately 2175 enrolls nearly 3100 students. At the present time approximately 2700 students, within the District are housed in temporary units (bungalows).

Examination of projected enrollment data indicates that enrollments will increase approximately 1000 students by 1965 - 1966. However these projections also indicate a slight decrease in enrollment from 1965 - 1966 through 1980 - 1981, the net result being a 1980 - 1981 enrollment which approximates that of today. The net task of the District is to rehabilitate and improve present facilities, replace existing temporary housing for 2700 pupils and add new housing for an increase of approximately 1000 students. This will have to be considered over the next twenty years as funds can be secured for these purposes.

BUILDING REQUIREMENTS

<u>School</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	
<u>Columbus:</u>		
6 - classrooms	\$ 120,000	
1 - kindergarten	24,000	
2 - M-R rooms	32,000	
1 - Library	28,000	
office and conference	9,000	
improve lighting	5,000	
provide flexibility in All Purpose room	<u>50,000</u>	
		\$268,000
<u>Cragmont Elementary and K-P</u>		
10 - classrooms	200,000	
Music room, office and conference area	60,000	
Cafeteria		
Auditorium	<u>90,000</u>	
		\$350,000
<u>Emerson:</u>		
Replace entire structure	<u>650,000</u>	
		\$650,000

<u>School</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	
<u>Franklin and K-P:</u>		
10 - classrooms	\$ 200,000	
Library, music room etc.	82,500	
provide flexibility in multi-purpose room	75,000	
light control and misc.	10,000	
		\$ 367,500
<u>Hillside and K-P:</u>		
4 - classrooms	80,000	
office, storage, nurses and counseling areas	40,000	
		120,000
<u>Jefferson:</u>		
Replace Primary Unit and Portables with 8 rooms	170,000	
Misc. exp. - sidewalks, light control, improved toilet facilities	50,000	
		220,000
<u>John Muir School:</u>		
lighting improvement, acoustical treatment	15,000	
Multi-purpose room made more flexible	25,000	
office, health, and counseling areas expanded	40,000	
		80,000

Le Conte:

4 classrooms	\$ 80,000
conference rooms and special purpose rooms	20,000
light control, acoustical treatment, and flexible division of space in auditorium	50,000

\$ 150,000

Longfellow:

8 classrooms	160,000
library	25,000
office, counseling, health areas	40,000

225,000

Oxford:

Replace entire structure with approximate 13 classrooms and necessary special services	550,000
---	---------

550,000

Thousand Oaks:

5 classrooms	100,000
office, music, speech, counseling work and storage areas	75,000
improved toilet facilities	50,000
improved lighting, acoustical control, and fire safety	30,000
library and multi-purpose room	80,000

335,000

<u>School</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	
<u>Washington</u>		
5 classrooms	\$ 100, 000	
office, health, and counseling area	<u>25, 000</u>	
		\$ 125, 000
<u>Whittier:</u>		
office area, health, counseling and special service areas	50, 000	
music room and 5 classrooms	<u>130, 000</u>	
		180, 000
<u>New proposed K-P</u>	<u>208, 000</u>	208, 000
<u>Burbank Junior High Schools</u>		
22 classrooms	440, 000	
Girls Gym - shower and toilet facilities	250, 000	
Cafeteria	125, 000	
office, health, counseling and conference areas	65, 000	
remodel cafeteria for classroom use	35, 000	
improved lighting, acoustical treatment and other necessary treatment	<u>30, 000</u>	
		945, 000

Lincoln:

office, counseling, health, speech and special education	\$ 75,000
Kindergarten (3) MR & special classrooms (4)	
music room	200,000
replace old building	600,000
approximately 9 additional classrooms to replace portables	180,000

\$1,055,000

Williard Junior School:

20 classrooms	400,000
Library	65,000
Cafeteria	125,000
Girls Gym including showers and toilet facilities	250,000
Administration Area	75,000

915,000

Garfield Junior High School

22 classrooms - , -	
including shops and science areas	440,000
Library	80,000
enlarge cafeteria	30,000
Administration area	30,000
remodel 30 existing classrooms for light and acoustical control and other necessary renovation	250,000

830,000

Berkeley High School

New multi-story classroom wing - approximately 40 rooms plus library and multi-purpose room	\$2, 000, 000
---	---------------

Remodeling and Alterations at:

Main Academic Building	275, 000
Grove Street Building	275, 000
P. E. Building and area	300, 000
Contingency 10%	285, 000

\$3, 135, 000

District Requirement
exclusive of sites \$10, 708, 500

Site acquisition at
Emerson, Lincoln,
Le Conte, Franklin,
Willard Jr. High
Berkeley Sr. High 400, 000

Site development
fees and con-
tingency 2, 718, 875

Total District Requirement \$13, 827, 375

A brief analysis of the total school facility improvements indicates the needs of the district exceed the statutory bonding limits. The total requirements, as we list them, approximate \$14,000,000 while the bonding limit of the District is approximately \$13,000,000. It is obvious that not even all current needs of the District can be satisfied at this time. This means priorities will have to be assigned to specific projects in order that the more serious deficiencies can be corrected first.

It must be remembered that the above mentioned figures are estimates based on current cost levels. Actual costs can never be determined until bids are opened and specific prices quoted. We do feel however, that if our estimates are high in some cases they probably are low in others. It is particularly difficult to estimate rehabilitation costs for older buildings. The net result should produce an overall average that will fall relatively close to the total actual cost. Probably more important than the precise accuracy of the estimates is the acceptance of the fact that the actual needs exceed the current bonding limits of the District and further acceptance of the fact that the longer the District waits in acting to meet these problems the more expensive it is going to become.

Up to this point we have not mentioned a considerable number of other needs of the school district for new facilities. These include another possible junior high school, a possible second senior high school,

possible sites for the proposed kindergarten - primary school or another possible school located in northeast Berkeley. Neither have we considered the McKinley Continuation School dilemma. These are problems beyond present possibilities to make present plans for -- so they must remain for future consideration and solution.

We have carefully considered the matter of site acquisition at the various schools as recommended in previous reports. We are in complete agreement with these appraisals. School sites are woefully inadequate according to modern educational standards. However, with the tremendous need for classrooms that exists, we feel that site acquisition at existing schools must be kept to an absolute minimum. It is expected that through the erection of new buildings, removal of some bungalows, and renovation of certain other buildings that greater utilization of present sites can be achieved. The only sites we feel which should definitely be acquired promptly are the present P. G. and E. property and one parcel at Emerson as these are necessary for immediate building purposes. Land acquisitions at Franklin, Le Conte, Lincoln and Willard Junior High School should be achieved as these parcels become available. Little or no acquisition of improved property at other schools should be undertaken at this time because funds are needed for more basic requirements. It is recommended that the past policy of securing necessary additions, to school sites when land becomes

voluntarily available from owners, be continued in the years ahead as funds permit.

Replacement of temporary housing with permanent structures should be a goal of the District. We realize that this will probably not be possible in the immediate future but the older inadequate bungalows should be replaced now. It will probably be necessary to retain the newer temporary units to provide flexibility in meeting the increased enrollments of the next few years and to get from these facilities full value for monies expended upon them.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Examination of the Citizens Advisory Council Report, of December, 1960, indicates that this Committee has provided the Board of Education with an excellent analysis of school facility needs. It is our opinion that this report was conservative in listing total needs. We feel that the site requests, as proposed, are unrealistic for immediate implementation.
2. We are of the opinion that priorities should be assigned to specific projects in order that the most serious deficiencies can be corrected first. For that reason we have grouped the various needs, as we see them, into four priorities.

Priority I

Oxford	-	\$550, 000
Emerson	-	650, 000 (includes site)
Lincoln	-	1, 055, 000
Cragmont and K-P	-	350, 000
Franklin and K-P	-	367, 500
Thousand Oaks	-	335, 000
Burbank Jr. High	-	945, 000
Garfield Jr. High	-	830, 000
Willard Jr. High	-	915, 000
Berkeley Sr. High	-	3, 205, 000 (includes site)

9, 202, 500

Fees, site development
and contingencies 2, 300, 625

Total Priority I \$11, 503, 125

Priority II

Longfellow	-\$225, 000
Hillside and K-P	- 120, 000
Additional site acquisition at: Franklin	
Le Conte	- 325, 000
Lincoln	
Willard Jr. High	

670, 000

Fees, site development
and contingencies 167, 500

Total Priority II \$ 837, 500

Priority III

Columbus	- \$ 268,000
Jefferson	- 220,000
John Muir	- 80,000
Le Conte	- 150,000
Washington	- 125,000
Whittier	- 180,000
	1,023,000

Fees, site development and contingencies	255,700
Total Priority III	\$1,278,700

Priority IV

Proposed Kindergarten-Primary- \$208,000

Total Priority IV:
exclusive of site, site
development, etc. \$208,000

We are of the opinion that the District should provide for its building needs according to a priority schedule similar to that presented here and do as much as it possibly can, within the framework of legal limitations.

3. Immediate needs are so pressing that a bond authorization seems imperative within the near future. It would seem that an early fall date, possibly between October 1, and 15, would be a logical time for this. It is our opinion that this question should be presented as a unified proposal for the total school districts' needs. The longer the District delays in moving to meet present needs, the greater the probability that future costs will exceed present estimates.
4. The relative costs of reconstructing the older buildings and their replacement by totally new structures -- as for example, Lincoln and Burbank Junior High School -- should be carefully weighed by the Board,

In such cases construction can be done in increments as funds are available since continuous use of existing classroom capacities will be necessary.

5. Outdoor physical education area at Berkeley High School is extremely limited. Relief, at Berkeley High could be gained by development of a football field at Garfield Junior High School. The Garfield Junior High School site is the largest in the District and should be fully utilized in the best interests of the entire district.
6. Many of the bungalows should be replaced with permanent type housing facilities when this becomes financially possible. In order that the District might retain flexibility in meeting demands of increased enrollments some temporary structures should be retained and moved from school to school as needed. The present location of bungalows, on the various school sites, has created difficult site utilization problems.
7. In order to insure maximum utility for a modern educational program in all remodeled and new construction projects, careful school by school planning is going to be necessary with continuous consultation among the Board of Education, professional staff, architects, building consultants and lay citizens.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C101743837

